



Management, Marketing and Operations -
Daytona Beach

David B. O'Malley College of Business

2010

Editorial for Dynamics of Innovation and Competitive Strategy in Transportation Research

Janet K. Tinoco

Embry Riddle Aeronautical University, tinocoj@erau.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.erau.edu/db-management>



Part of the [Marketing Commons](#), [Strategic Management Policy Commons](#), and the [Technology and Innovation Commons](#)

Scholarly Commons Citation

Tinoco, J. K. (2010). Editorial for Dynamics of Innovation and Competitive Strategy in Transportation Research. *World Review of Intermodal Transportation Research*, 3(3). Retrieved from <https://commons.erau.edu/db-management/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the David B. O'Malley College of Business at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Management, Marketing and Operations - Daytona Beach by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact commons@erau.edu.

Editorial

Janet K. Tinoco

Department of Management, Marketing and Operations,
College of Business,
Embry Riddle Aeronautical University,
600 S. Clyde Morris Blvd.,
Daytona Beach, FL 32114, USA
E-mail: tinocoj@erau.edu

Biographical notes: Janet K. Tinoco received her PhD from the University of Central Florida. She is an Assistant Professor of Marketing and Management in the Department of Management, Marketing and Operations in the College of Business, Embry Riddle Aeronautical University. Her areas of teaching include strategic management and marketing while her research centres on innovation and strategy. She also holds Master's Degree in International Business and an Undergraduate Degree in Electrical Engineering. Her work has appeared in *World Review of Intermodal Transportation Research* (2010), *World Review of Science, Technology, and Sustainable Development* (2010) and *International Journal of Sustainable Strategic Management* (2010).

While innovation has been noted to be essential to sustained competitive advantage in many industry sectors, academic and practitioner research of innovation in transportation has been minimal. Yet, transportation provides a unique context in which innovation and its positive impacts on the organisation, industry and the nation as a whole is examined. The idea of this special issue was born out of the author's research into the types of innovation developed and implemented by all cargo airlines in the USA throughout air transportation history and the resultant impacts to both the firm and the industry (see Tinoco and Johnson, 2010). With this research effort, it became clear that studying innovation in transportation would be a worthy endeavour, as the advantages it brings with successful implementation are significant and critical for positive sustainable performance.

Thompson (1965) referred to innovation as "the generation, acceptance, and implementation of new ideas, processes, products, and services (p.2)." Since this time, the answer to "what is innovation?" has evolved and taken multiple forms – some simplified, some more complex. Researchers and political entities have diverged on the innovation concept and definition, taking different paths, one path attempting to broaden it to include success factors (European Commission, 1995) and restrictions to organisational settings (Pierce and Delbecq, 1977), while another path simplifying it, defining innovation merely as the commercialisation of an invention (Porter, 1990; Ahuja and Lampert, 2001).

It is essential that we, as academicians, researchers and practitioners, understand that today innovation is composed of multiple dimensions, ranging from product and production process innovations to marketing and organisational innovations.

Even within an innovation dimension, multiple types abound. For example, product innovations have been categorised into continuous or discontinuous (Robertson, 1967); radical or incremental, market breakthroughs or technological breakthroughs (Chandy and Tellis, 1998); competence enhancing vs. destroying (Tushman and Anderson, 1986), broad or localised (Kenny, 2003); architectural and modular innovations (Henderson and Clark, 1990); sustaining or disruptive (Christensen, 1997); architectural, and market niche, regular or revolutionary (Abernathy and Clark, 1985).

Process innovations have also been further detailed and broadened. They now include not only production processes, but also administrative and organisational processes (Troy et al., 2001; Johannessen et al., 2001) and those processes used to sell, distribute, or service products (Robert, 1993; Damanpour and Gopalakrishnan, 2001). Lastly, innovation has also been categorised into technical and administrative or organisational (Daft and Becker, 1978; Damanpour, 1991, 1996). Technical innovations are those that “pertain to products, services, and the technology used to produce products or render services (Damanpour 1996, p.698).” Organisational innovation is innovation involving “organisational structure, administrative processes, and human resources; they are indirectly related to the basic work activities of an organisation (Damanpour, 1996, p.698).”

As industries age, innovations developed and implemented within organisations change in type and frequency (Utterback and Abernathy, 1975; Utterback, 1994). Innovation in manufacturing industries begins with radical product innovations, followed by production process innovations and incremental product improvements. Service industries follow a reverse innovation life cycle, beginning with adoption of Information Technology (IT) for development of process innovations. As the service industry ages, the generation of new service (product) innovations follows (Barras, 1986, 1990).

Beyond product and production process innovations, there is still minimal research as when other types of innovation occur within the industry life cycle (cf. Tinoco, 2010). In transportation, research in the various types of innovation and when they occur in the life cycle is imperative to organisational and industry learning and sustained performance, yet it has gone largely ignored by academics, especially in many of the service-oriented transportation industries.

Furthermore, there is an enormous gap in research with respect to the less ‘visible’ innovations mentioned earlier, e.g., administrative and organisational innovations that focus on organisational structure, administrative processes and human resources, and technical innovations that pertain to the technology used to produce products and render services. With the current attention on climate change, innovation in sustainability has also begun to gain momentum. All of the aforementioned less ‘visible’ types of innovations often provide advantages, as they challenge competitors to discover and uncover a rare and valuable innovation that is not easily imitated or substituted.

Innovation is influenced by multiple entities, including organisation, industry and nation. In this special issue, Ian Douglas discusses competitive advantage at the organisational level analysing relatively new dual business models that support product (service) innovations in terms of long-haul services and premium cabins for value-based airlines. Despite the theoretical advantages, many value-based airlines struggle to turn these services into adequate revenue-generating programmes. However, Douglas clearly outlines the exceptions where several carriers have recently implemented a dual model strategy successfully. A question that remains is how critical are the characteristics of a home country nation and the travel destination country in terms of economy,

demographics, policy, etc., to the success of an innovative dual business model in air travel services.

The authors Anke Arnaud and Michael J. Williams provide an overview of innovation for sustainability in transportation and propose whether organisations, industries and nations are doing enough to develop and implement these types of innovation that so critically impact the world and our environment. Early in 2010 at the global summit on climate change, the largest economies pledged to reduce emissions and governments promised to spend approximately \$521B on their efforts in sustainability, including the necessary and innovative green technologies. Several months following this agreement, only 16% of the funds had been spent (Harvey, 2010). Clearly, there is significant room for improvement.

The authors Bart Wiegmans and Harry Geerlings take a micro-perspective of sustainability innovations by examining the issue in terms of deep-sea ports and the environmental problems, opportunities available and the success potential. They also ask the critical questions: What is the true goal of sustainability innovation and who or what is the recipient(s) of its success? Is it the business, the port, the country or the world?

The paper by Tamilla Curtis and Irina Swenson examines the link between government policy, competitive strategy at the national and organisational levels, and product innovation within the Russian aviation industry. They clearly argue the case that the future of Russia's economic health is partially dependent on the global success of its aviation sector (among other key industries) and its host of new products and services, innovative process technologies, specialised skills and brand reputation.

As can be seen, strong national influences on innovation are threaded throughout these aforementioned papers. With respect to level of innovative activity, nation differs according to 'structure of production', i.e., raw-material-based production vs. knowledge-intensive production, as well as R&D expenditures on each (Duckworth, 1967) and government regulations (Murray, 1976; Capon et al., 1992). They also differ in terms of levels of technological development, organisational structure and characteristics, and in natural resources (Porter, 1990). In national systems, the country's economic composition and the technical and education infrastructure also influence the levels of innovation (Edquist, 1997; Porter, 1990; Caccamo, 1998). Differences in national innovation levels may be a result of societal systems, i.e., capitalist societies engage in more innovation in the quest for competitive advantage while socialists innovate as a result of state demand (Murray, 1976).

While the theme of innovation ties each of the papers together, the stand-out issue in each of these papers is that innovation is a challenging, never-ending process of success and failure, of competitive advantage and of competitive disadvantage, of learning, unlearning, and relearning, and is a result of multiple influential factors at all levels. Innovation is a risk, and it can be a risk for all involved stakeholders: the individual, the firm, the industry, the nation and the world. Yet, without innovation, we do not move forward and this is nowhere more true than in the transportation sector. I hope that this issue will benefit academia, practitioners and policy-makers in their innovation efforts and increase interchange and exchange of innovative ideas, at all levels and all dimensions of innovation.

Acknowledgements

I thank all the authors, reviewers and the editors for their efforts and contributions to this special issue.

References

- Abernathy, W.J. and Clark, K.B. (1985) 'Innovation: mapping the winds of creative destruction', *Research Policy*, Vol. 14, pp.3–22.
- Ahuja, G. and Lampert, C.M. (2001) 'Entrepreneurship in the large corporation: a longitudinal study of how established firms create breakthrough inventions', *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, pp.521–543.
- Barras, R. (1986) 'Towards a theory of innovation in services', *Research Policy*, Vol. 1, pp.161–173.
- Barras, R. (1990) 'Interactive innovation in financial and business services, the vanguard of the service revolution', *Research Policy*, Vol. 19, pp.215–237.
- Cacomo, J.-L. (1998) 'Review article, system of innovation approach', *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp.254–269.
- Capon, N., Farley, J.U., Lehmann, D.R. and Hulbert, J.M. (1992) 'Profiles of product innovators among large US manufacturers', *Management Science*, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp.157–169.
- Chandy, R.K. and Tellis, G.J. (1998) 'Organizing for radical product innovation, the overlooked role of willingness to Cannibalize', *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp.474–487.
- Christensen, C.M. (1997) *The Innovator's Dilemma, When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*, Harvard Business School Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Daft, R.L. and Becker, S.W. (1978) *The Innovative Organization*, Elsevier, New York, NY.
- Damanpour, F. (1991) 'Organizational innovation, a meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators', *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp.555–590.
- Damanpour, F. (1996) 'Organizational complexity and innovation, developing and testing multiple contingency models', *Management Science*, Vol. 42, May, pp.693–716.
- Damanpour, F. and Gopalakrishnan, S. (2001) 'The dynamics of the adoption of product and process innovations in organizations', *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp.45–65.
- Duckworth, W.E. (1967) 'The determination of total research effort', *Operational Research Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp.359–373.
- Edquist, C. (Ed.) (1997) *Systems of Innovation-Technologies, Institutions, and Organizations*, Edited by J.d.l. Mothe, London and Washington, Pinter.
- European Commission (1995) *Green Paper on Innovation*, European Commission, Brussels.
- Harvey, F. (2010) 'Scramble for funds in a harsh climate', *Financial Times*, June 4, pp.1–2.
- Henderson, R. and Clark, K.B. (1990) 'Architectural innovation, the reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp.9–30.
- Johannessen, J.-A., Olsen, B. and Lumpkin, G.T. (2001) 'Innovation as newness, What is New, How new, and new to Whom?', *European Journal of Innovation Management*, Vol. 4 (1), p.20.
- Kenny, J. (2003) 'Effective project management for strategic innovation and change in an organizational context', *Project Management Journal*, pp.43–53.
- Murray, M.L. (1976) 'The theory and practice of innovation in the private insurance industry', *The Journal of Risk and Insurance*, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp.653–671.

- Pierce, J.L. and Delbecq, A.L. (1977) 'Organization structure, individual attitudes, and innovation', *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.27–37.
- Porter, M.E. (1990) *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Robert, M. (1993) 'Opportunity search, What's that knocking at the door?', *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp.24–39.
- Robertson, T.S. (1967) 'The process of innovation and the diffusion of innovation', *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 31, January, pp.14–19.
- Thompson, V.A. (1965) 'Bureaucracy and innovation', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp.1–20.
- Tinoco, J.K. (2010) 'Marketing innovation, the unheralded innovation vehicle to sustained competitive advantage', *International Journal of Sustainable Strategic Management*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp.168–183.
- Tinoco, J.K. and Johnson, R.C. (2010) 'Up, up, and away, the dynamics of innovation in the US air cargo transportation industry', *World Review of Intermodal Transportation Research*, Vol. 3, Nos. 1–2, pp.167–180.
- Troy, L.C., Szymanski, D.M. and Rajan Varadarajan, P. (2001) 'Generating new product ideas, an initial investigation of the role of market information and organizational characteristics', *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp.89–102.
- Tushman, M. and Anderson, P. (1986) 'Technological discontinuities and organizational environments', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp.439–465.
- Utterback, J.M. (1994) *Mastering the Dynamics of Innovation*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Utterback, J.M. and Abernathy, W.J. (1975) 'A dynamic model of process and product innovation', *OMEGA, The International Journal of Management Science*, Vol. 3, No. 6, pp.639–656.